



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,599	06/12/2000	Dongyan Wang	SAM1.0064	7070

7590

12/05/2002

Kenneth L Sherman
Sherman & Sherman
Seventeenth Floor
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,599

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because some of the numbers in fig. 10 are unreadable. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses "said" in lines 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10. Correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 28, line 24-25: Phrase "A proxy 117" should be changed to --A bridge 117--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 10-19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 10, page 55: Phrase "a communication medium than can be used" should be changed to --a communication medium that can be used--.

Claims 11-19 are dependent on claim 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-22 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lea et al ("Lea", US #6032202).

As per independent claim 1, Lea teaches a method for providing a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to a network, the method comprising the steps of:

for at least one of said devices:

obtaining information from one or more of the devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12); and

generating a user interface description based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description including a reference associated with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, such that the reference includes at least one link to information contained in said devices currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating the user interface description such that the reference in the user interface description provides access to at least the information in each corresponding device (col. 3, lines 1-4).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating the user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device (col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes device identification information (col. 7, lines 20-27).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device (col. 6, lines 40-48).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating the user interface description such that each reference in the user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device (col. 2, lines 57-67 through col. 3, lines 1-4, and col. 6, lines 40-48).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating the user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device (col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per independent claim 10, Lea teaches a network system for performing a service, comprising:

- a physical layer, wherein the physical layer provides a communication medium that can be used by devices to communicate with each other (col. 7, lines 62-67);

- one or more devices connected to the physical layer (col. 7, lines 62-67), each device storing information including device information (col. 6, lines 40-48);

- an agent in at least one device for:

- obtaining information from one or more of the devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12); and

generating a user interface description based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description including a reference associated with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, such that the reference includes at least one link to information contained in said devices currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 2 and 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 15; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 16; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, it is a similar scope to claim 17; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 26, it is a similar scope to claim 18; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lea in view of Venkatraman et al ("Venkatraman", US #5956487).

As per claims 4 and 5, which are both dependent on claim 1, Lea does not disclose the step of generating the user interface description further includes the steps of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network and the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device. Venkatraman discloses that in col. 3, lines 5-61. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Venkatraman of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of one or more of said first and second devices in Lea's method since HTML would allow the devices to interface with Internet, from service providers, via HTTP protocol.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 14; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat. 6044403 to Gerszberg, Irwin et al. discloses network server platform for internet, JAVA server and video application server.

US Pat. 6337899 to Alcendor, Tommy et al. discloses speaker verification for authorizing updates to user subscription service received by internet service provider (ISP) using an intelligent peripheral (IP) in an advanced intelligent network (AIN).

US Pat. 6374293 to Dev, Roger H. et al. discloses network management system using model-based intelligence.

US Pat. 6480889 to Saito, Takeshi et al. discloses scheme for managing nodes connected to a home network according to their physical locations.

US Pat. 6157645 to Shobatake, Yasuro discloses ATM communication system and ATM communication method.

US Pat 6169725 to Gibbs, Simon J. et al. discloses apparatus and method for restoration of internal connections in a home audio/video system.

Inquires

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
November 25, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100